# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS CENTRAL SECTION



LOUIS ALBERGHINI,
Plaintiff,

V.

SIMONDS INDUSTRIES, INC., Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO.

04-40092-MMG

# **COMPLAINT**

# **PARTIES**

- 1. The plaintiff, Louis Alberghini, is currently sixty-three (63) years old, (DOB: August 30, 1940) and resides at 188 Lancaster Road, Berlin, Massachusetts 01503.
- 2. The defendant, Simonds Industries, Inc., is a corporation duly organized by law and has a usual place of business at Intervale Road, Fitchburg, Worcester County, Massachusetts 01420.
- 3. Defendant continuously employed the plaintiff from April 1982 until January 7, 2000 and again from February 2000 until May 31, 2001 at its Fitchburg, Massachusetts facility.
- 4. Defendant, at all times relevant to this complaint, engaged in an industry affecting commerce and had more than 20 employees, which makes the Defendant subject to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA), as amended.

AMOUNT \$ 150.00
SUMMONS ISSUED L
LOCAL RULE 4.1
WAIVER FORM

MCF ISSUED\_

DATE 5-2005

# **JURISDICTION**

5. Jurisdiction is conferred on this court by 29 U.S.C. § 623 and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and supplemental jurisdiction is conferred on this court by 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

# **ALLEGATIONS**

- 6. On January 7, 2000, the defendant terminated the plaintiff's employment. The plaintiff was the Manager of Manufacturing Services at the time of his termination. However, approximately 30 days later, the defendant re-hired the plaintiff with no loss of prior service as a project engineer until May 31, 2001 when the defendant terminated the plaintiff a second time. The plaintiff was 60 years old at that time.
  - 7. The plaintiff has a Bachelor of Science degree in electrical engineering.
- 8. The plaintiff satisfactorily performed the project engineer position, and other positions, such as Facilities Manager, Electrical Maintenance Supervisor, Electrical Engineer, and Manager of Manufacturing Services, that he had previously performed for the defendant during the nineteen (19) years that plaintiff worked for defendant. The defendant had never disciplined the plaintiff during his employment.
- 9. The defendant hired Richard Brault (age 49) on August 14, 2000, Jeremy Dexter (age 24) on July 17, 2000 and Peter Duperry (age 24) on July 23, 2001. These employees, who are younger than the plaintiff, were retained by defendant or hired by defendant after the plaintiff was terminated, and assumed certain job duties and projects of the plaintiff after the plaintiff was terminated on May 31, 2001.

- When the defendant terminated the plaintiff in January 2000, the defendant 10. alleged that it was eliminating middle-managers at the Fitchburg facility in which the plaintiff was included as the Manufacturing Services Manager. However, all the middle-managers that were terminated were age protected employees. The defendant rehired one of those middlemanagers, James Bourque, who was only 48 years old at the time, and continues to employ him. The plaintiff was rehired at the Fitchburg facility as a project engineer for a little over a year and then defendant terminated him again on May 31, 2001. No middle-manager 60 years of age or older was rehired by defendant after the January 7, 2000 reduction in force on a continuing basis.
- Younger employees who were retained by defendant replaced the terminated 11. middle-managers or performed or assumed the job duties of the terminated middle-managers albeit with different job titles.
- At the time plaintiff was terminated the second time, the defendant provided no 12. reason for the termination to the plaintiff. The defendant has since alleged that it reorganized the engineering department and that the second termination was due to financial crisis of the company. However, after plaintiff's termination in May 2001, the defendant continued to acquire other companies, continued to hire younger engineers and other managers at high salaries despite its alleged financial constraints.
- The plaintiff was equally qualified to perform certain engineering positions that 13. the defendant alleges it restructured and in which younger employees were retained or hired for those positions or performed or assumed those job duties.

- The defendant did not treat age neutral in the reductions in force on either 14. occasion and the defendant's alleged reasons for the plaintiff's termination on May 31, 2001 are mere pretexts for age discrimination.
- The defendant provided the plaintiff a release of claims in connection with his 15. termination on May 31, 2001. The release did not specifically waive state or federal age discrimination claims, nor was the purpose of the release to waive such claims. The defendant also did not provide the plaintiff with a list of employees, whose jobs were being eliminated, including the age, job titles and classifications of the affected employees. The defendant did not provide plaintiff 21 days to review the waiver and release of claims. In short, the waiver and release of claims violates most of the requirements of 29 C.F.R. § 1625.22 for a valid release of federal age discrimination claims.
- On November 23, 2001, the plaintiff filed a timely charge of age discrimination 16. against defendant at the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination (MCAD), Docket No. 012310657, which was cross-filed at the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), Charge No. 16C200200719.
- On September 8, 2003, the plaintiff received a lack of probable cause disposition 17. from the MCAD and the plaintiff timely appealed the MCAD disposition on or about September 17, 2003. The MCAD upheld its disposition on December 17, 2003.
- The plaintiff received a Dismissal and Notification of Rights from MCAD on or 18. about September 4, 2003 and Notice of Right to Sue from the EEOC on April 26, 2004.

4

# **COUNT I – VIOLATION OF M.G.L. C. 151B** UNLAWFUL TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT

- Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 19. 18 above.
- As a direct and proximate result of the defendant's intentional and unlawful acts 20. of age discrimination in terminating his employment on May 31, 2001 in violation of M.G.L. c. 151B, plaintiff has suffered irreparable economic harm, losses, damages and emotional distress.

# **COUNT II - VIOLATION OF ADEA** UNLAWFUL TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT

- Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 21. 20 above.
- As a direct and proximate result of the defendant's willful, intentional and 22. unlawful acts of age discrimination in terminating his employment on May 31, 2001 in violation of the ADEA, plaintiff has suffered irreparable economic harm, losses, damages and emotional distress.

# **COUNT III - VIOLATION OF OWBPA**

- Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 23. 22 above.
- As a direct and proximate result of defendant's unlawful violation of the 24. requirements of the OWBPA, as codified at 29 C.F.R. § 1625.22, for establishing a valid waiver and release of age discrimination claims, the plaintiff has suffered irreparable economic harm, losses and damages.

5

# **COUNT IV – CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1991**

- Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 25. 24 above.
- Defendant's conduct as alleged herein constituted intentional and unlawful age 26. discrimination and, as a direct and proximate result, plaintiff has suffered future pecuniary losses, emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, mental anguish, loss of enjoyment of life, and other nonpecuniary losses for which defendant is liable to plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff demands judgment against the defendant, and requests that he be awarded full back pay, front pay, reimbursement for lost benefits, compensatory damages, damages for mental anguish and emotional distress, multiple and punitive damages and costs of suit, reasonable attorney's fees and interest as allowed by law, and any other relief that the court deems appropriate, fair and just.

# PLAINTIFF DEMANDS A TRIAL BY JURY WHERE APPLICABLE

Louis Alberghini, The Plaintiff. By his attorneys,

Marcia L. Elliott, Esq. (BBO# 564291) John M. Flick, Esq. (BBO# 652169)

Elliott Law Office, P.C. 301 Central Street Gardner, MA 01440

(978) 632-7948

Dated: May 26, 2004

		UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETA A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
1.	Title of case (nam	ne of first party on each side only) ALBERGHINI W SEMONDS INDUSTRIES, INC
_		IN COUNTRICE
2.		h the case belongs based upon the numbered nature of suit code listed on the civil cover sheet. (See
	local rule 40.1(a)(	<sup>1)).</sup> 2005 MAY 28 A II: 46
	<u> </u>	160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT.
	X ii.	195, 388, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 550, 555, 625, 710, 720, 730, ் . வில் மொழிர்ச் டுடு நிற் or AO 121 740, 790, 791, 820*, 830*, 840*, 850, 890, 892-894, 895, 950. ் ் இரன் இரை நிற்குள்கள் இரு copyright cases
	411.	110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 365, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371, 380, 385, 450, 891.
	IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510, 530, 610, 620, 630, 640, 650, 660, 690, 810, 861-866, 870, 871, 875, 900.
	v.	150, 152, 153.
3.		, if any, of related cases. (See local rule 40.1(g)). If more than one prior related case has been filed in e indicate the title and number of the first filed case in this court.
4.	Has a prior action	n between the same parties and based on the same claim ever been filed in this court?
		YES NO
5.		nt in this case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affecting the public interest? (See
	28 USC <b>§</b> 2403)	
	Man Indep 11 6 8	YES NO X
	ir so, is the U.S.A.	or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party?
		YES NO
6.	Is this case requi	red to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuant to title 28 USC §2284?
		YES NO X
7.		es in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the united states and the Commonwealth of governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule
		YES X NO
	A.	If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside?
		Eastern Division
	В.	If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental
		agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside?
		Eastern Division Central Division Western Division
8.		Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If are sheet identifying the motions)
	a set emerini e maha	
(PLEAS	SE TYPE OR PRINT)	YES L NO L
ATTORNEYS NAME Marcia L. Elliott, Elliott Law Office, P.C		

307 Central Street, Gardner, MA 01440

TELEPHONE NO. (978) 632-7948

MAG. JUDGE

SJS 44 (Rev. 3/99)

AMOUN

APPLYING IFP

CIVIL COVER SHEETA

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.) DEFENDANTS OFFICE I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Louis P. Alberghini Simonds Industries, Inc. 188 Lancaster Road 135 Intermaller ReadA ||: 46 Berlin, MA 01503 Fitchburg, MA 01420 County of Residence of First Listed (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Worcester (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (IN U.S. PISAINTHE CASESIONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES ASSETTE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED. (c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) 78632-7948 Attorneys (If Known (508) 926-3434 Marcia L. Elliott, Esq. Jonathan R. Sigel Elliott Law Office, P.C. Bowditch & Dewey, LLP 307 Central Street, Gardner, MA 01440 311 Main St., Worcester, MA 01608 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases On ly) and One Box for De fendant) DEF ☐ 1 U.S. Government X 3 Federal Question Citizen of This State  $\Box$  1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4 **Plaintiff** (U.S. Government Not a Party) of Business In This State ☐ 2 U.S. Government ☐ 4 Diversity Citizen of Another State □ 2 □ 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 □ 5 (Indicate Citi zenship of Parties Defendant of Business h Another State in Item III) Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation □ 6 □6 Foreign Country IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) CONTRACT TORTS FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES ☐ 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY 610 Agriculture 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 400 State Reap portionment ☐ 120 Marine 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Injury— 620 Other Food & Drug 🛘 410 Antitatat ☐ 130 Miller Act 315 Airplane Product Mcd. Malpractice 625 Drug Related Scizure 423 Withdrawal ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability ☐ 365 Personal Injury -of Property 21 USC 28 USC 157 ☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment 🗀 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability 630 Liquor Laws 460 Deportation & Enforcement of ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal PROPERTY RIGHTS Slander 640 R.R. & Truck ☐ 470 Racke teer Influenced and ☐ 1948Metticare Act 330 Federal Employers Injury Product 650 Airline Regs. Corrupt Organizations ☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Liability Liability 660 Occupational ☐ 810 Selective Service 830 Patent 340 Marine Student Loans PERSONAL PROPERTY Safety/Health ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ ☐ 840 Trad cmark (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 690 Other ☐ 370 Other Fraud Exchange ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpaymen Liability ☐ 371 Truth in Lending 375 Customer Challenge of Veteran's Benefits LABOR 350 M otor V chicle SOCIAL SECURITY 380 Other Personal 12 USC 3410 ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits 355 M otor V chicle Property Damage ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts 710 Fair Labor Standards ■ 861 H IA (13 95㎡) ☐ 190 Other Contract Product Liability ☐ 385 Property Damage ☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability Act п 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury Product Liability ☐ 893 Environm ental Matters 720 Labor/M gmt. Relatio 863 DIW C/DIW W (405 (g)) ☐ 894 Energy Albeation Act REAL PROPERTY CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIONS 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 895 Freedom of ŏ 730 Labor/M gmt.Reportin 865 RS I (405(g)) 210 Land Condemnation 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Information Act & Disclosure Act П ☐ 900 Appeal of Fcc 220 Force losure FEDERAL TAX SUITS 442 Employment Sentence 740 Railway Labor Act 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 443 Housing/ Determinational Access to Habcas Corpus: ■ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff 240 Torts to Land Justice Accommod ations 530 General 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 444 W clfare S35 Dc ath Penalty 950 Constitutionality of 245 Tort Product Liability or Defendant) 290 All Other Real Property 440 Other Civil Rights 540 Mandamus & Other State Statites 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. 871 IRS -Third Party ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions 550 Civil Rights Security Act 26 USC 7609 555 Prison Condition (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY) V. ORIGIN Appeal to District Transferred from another district Judge from  $\square$  2 Original Removed from Reinstated or 🏻 5 Remanded from (specify) ☐ 6 Multidistrict Magistrate Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened Litigation Judgment (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are fling and write buef statement of cause. VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Do not cite jurisd ictional statutes unless diversity.) 29 USC Sec. 623 and OWBPA 29 C.F.R. Sec. 1625,22 VII. REQUESTED IN ☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND unspecified CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: UNDER FR CP 23 COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND: See VIII. RELATED CASE(S) instructions): IF ANY JUDG DOCKET NUMBER 9/09 OR OFFICE ASE ONL